

1 **UNDERTAKING J17.3**

2
3 **Undertaking**

4
5 To provide the total cost OPG is paying to augmented staff and the associated FTEs.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 **Response**

13
14 In determining the most cost effective approach to completing planned work programs,
15 OPG considers available resource options, including augmented staff to supplement its
16 workforce and manage peak demands. Augmented staff are also utilized to help
17 address labour declines experienced as a result of greater than anticipated attrition and
18 subsequent hiring lags, such as in 2016. (see also J14.3 and J15.12).
19

20 In 2016, OPG incurred approximately \$83M in costs for external vendors for augmented
21 staff to complete Nuclear OM&A, capital and nuclear liabilities funded work programs.
22 This total amount comprises approximately \$44M for Nuclear Operations, including
23 outage related inspection and maintenance testing, approximately \$32M for the
24 Darlington Refurbishment Program (DRP), and an additional \$7M in allocated corporate
25 support costs for Nuclear Operations.
26

27 OPG does not track FTE associated with augmented staff. Based on month end
28 headcount information, for the purpose of this response, OPG has estimated that there
29 were on average 416 FTE directly supporting the Nuclear business in 2016, of which
30 180 FTE was for DRP. Using the ratio of direct costs per FTE based on the above total
31 costs for the Nuclear business, OPG estimates that there were 39 FTE allocated to
32 Nuclear Operations from corporate support, for a total of 455 FTE including DRP.
33

34 Augmented staff supporting steady state operations were considered in the Goodnight
35 benchmarking study at Ex. F3-1-1, Attachment 1 (see L-6.2-1 Staff 109, and EB-2013-
36 0321, Ex. F5-1-1, Part A, p. 17).

1 **UNDERTAKING J17.12**

2
3 **Undertaking**

4
5 TO DESCRIBE HOW THE REMOVAL OF D2O PROJECT FROM THE APPLICATION
6 AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THAT HAS BEEN HANDLED ON A
7 CORPORATE SCORECARD BASIS FOR THE YEARS IN WHICH THEY WOULD
8 HAVE IMPACTED THE SCORECARD.
9

10
11
12 **Response**

13
14 In 2016, a score of 0 was assigned to the Campus Plan Metric. This metric consists of
15 milestones for 3 discrete Campus Plan projects: an interim milestone related to the
16 Heavy Water project (D2O) which was achieved, and milestones for installation of the
17 Third Emergency Power Generator and Containment Filtered Venting System which
18 were not achieved. The integrated score for the 3 projects was adjusted to 0, and had a
19 weighting of 10% on the 2016 scorecard.
20

21 In 2017, the Refurbishment Project Cost measure may be impacted if the cost of the
22 D2O project exceeds the overall project budget, including contingency, for the planned
23 2017 work, and other savings to offset costs cannot be found. This work is currently
24 scheduled for completion in 2017. The Refurbishment Project Cost has a 10%
25 weighting on the 2017 Corporate Balanced Scorecard.